

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

7 WAYNE THOMAS ANSTROM,

8 Petitioner,

9 v.

10 STEVE SINCLAIR,

11 Respondent.
12

NO. CV-09-103-RHW

**ORDER GRANTING
RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO
DISMISS**

13 Before the Court are Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Ct.
14 Recs. 1 & 12), Motion for Evidentiary Hearing (Ct. Rec. 5), and Motion to
15 Continue (Ct. Rec. 22), and Respondent's Motion to Dismiss (Ct. Rec. 16). For the
16 reasons set forth below, the Court grants Respondent's motion and dismisses the
17 Petition as time-barred.

18 **I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

19 Petitioner was convicted of first degree assault while armed with a deadly
20 weapon, second degree assault, unlawful possession of a firearm, and four counts
21 of drive-by shooting in Grant County Superior Court on February 8, 2002. The
22 Washington Court of Appeals, Division III, affirmed Petitioner's conviction on
23 challenges of ineffective assistance of counsel, prosecutorial misconduct, and
24 constitutionally deficient information and jury instructions on May 23, 2003. *State*
25 *v. Anstrom*, 117 Wash. App. 1005 (2003). The Washington Supreme Court
26 summarily denied the petition for review on February 3, 2004. *State v. Anstrom*,
27 150 Wash. 2d 1033, 84 P.3d 1229 (2004).

28 On January 23, 2005, Petitioner filed a motion to vacate or set aside or

1 correct his superior court sentence, which was transferred to the Washington Court
2 of Appeals as a personal restraint petition on February 11, 2005 (Cause No. 23863-
3 6-III). On February 11, 2005, Petitioner also separately filed a personal restraint
4 petition in the Washington Court of Appeals (Cause No. 23810-5-III). These two
5 filings were consolidated for review until the two petitions were severed and the
6 former dismissed by the Washington Court of Appeals on August 24, 2006.
7 Petitioner sought review of the dismissal of Cause No. 23863-6-III, which was
8 denied by the Washington Supreme Court on December 4, 2006. A certificate of
9 finality was entered by the Washington Court of Appeals on January 26, 2007.
10 Cause No. 23810-5-III was dismissed by the Court of Appeals on August 2, 2007.
11 *In re Petition for relief from Personal Restraint of Wayne Thomas Anstrom*, 139
12 Wash. App. 1092 (2007). Review was denied by a Washington Supreme Court
13 commissioner on January 3, 2008; there was apparently no motion to modify the
14 ruling. On December 31, 2008, the Washington Court of Appeals entered a
15 mandate terminating review of No. 23810-5-III. This petition was placed in the
16 prison mail system for filing with the Court on March 31, 2009.

17 II. ANALYSIS

18 Whether Petitioner's federal habeas petition is timely is determined by the
19 Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act ("AEDPA"), 28 U.S.C. § 2244.
20 Petitioner's state conviction was finalized on May 3, 2004, ninety days after the
21 Washington Supreme Court denied review of Petitioner's appeal. *See Harris v.*
22 *Carter*, 515 F.3d 1051, 1052-53 (9th Cir. 2008). Under the AEDPA, Petitioner was
23 required to seek federal habeas corpus relief within one year of this date pursuant
24 to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A), unless the one year statute of limitations period was
25 tolled, either statutorily or equitably.

26 A. The Habeas Corpus Petition is Untimely Under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

27 The AEDPA tolls the one-year limitations period while a "properly filed
28 application" for post-conviction review is pending in state court. 28 U.S.C. §

1 2244(d)(2); *Nino v. Galaza*, 183 F.3d 1003, 1005 (9th Cir. 1999).

2 Petitioner's conviction became final ninety days after the decision of the
3 Washington Supreme Court denying review on February 3, 2004, because no
4 petition for certiorari was filed. *Bowen v. Roe*, 188 F.3d 1157, 1158-59 (9th Cir.
5 1999). Therefore, the decision became final on May 3, 2004. The statute then ran
6 for 265 days from May 4, 2004 until January 23, 2005, when Petitioner filed his
7 first personal restraint petition.

8 The statute was tolled from January 23, 2005, until January 3, 2008, the date
9 the Washington Supreme Court Commissioner entered his Ruling Denying Review
10 on the last of Petitioner's collateral attacks. The statute began running again on
11 January 4, 2008, and ran for approximately 15 months until May 31, 2009, when
12 Petitioner signed his habeas corpus petition and apparently placed it in the prison
13 mail system. Thus, a total of approximately 715 days, well in excess of one year,
14 ran for purposes of the statute of limitations between the date Petitioner's
15 conviction became final for federal habeas corpus review purposes and the date he
16 filed this habeas corpus petition.

17 Petitioner asserts that the federal statute of limitations was tolled until the
18 Washington Court of Appeals entered its mandate terminating review of his second
19 personal restraint petition (Case No. 23810-5-III) on December 31, 2008, thereby
20 making this petition timely filed. This assertion lacks merit. State post-conviction
21 appeals toll the federal one-year limitations period only until denial of review by
22 the state supreme court, and not until the subsequent entry of a mandate by the
23 clerk of the intermediate appellate court. *Harris v. Carter*, 515 F.3d 1051, 1053
24 (9th Cir. 2008); *see also White v. Klitzkie*, 281 F.3d 920, 923-24 n. 4 (9th Cir.
25 2002) (*citing Wixom v. Washington*, 264 F.3d 894, 897-98 (9th Cir. 2001)). This
26 habeas corpus petition is, therefore, barred by the one-year statute of limitations
27 unless grounds for equitable tolling exist.

28 **B. Equitable Tolling is Unavailable**

1 Although “AEDPA's statute of limitations provision is subject to equitable
2 tolling,” it is “unavailable in most cases.” *Corjasso v. Ayers*, 278 F.3d 874, 877
3 (9th Cir. 2002) (internal citations omitted). Equitable tolling “is appropriate only if
4 extraordinary circumstances beyond a prisoner's control make it impossible to file
5 a petition on time.” *Id.* (internal citations omitted); *see also Frye v. Hickman*, 273
6 F.3d 1144, 1146 (9th Cir. 2001); *Allen v. Lewis*, 255 F.3d 798, 799-800 (9th Cir.
7 2001). “External forces,” not a petitioner's “lack of diligence” must account for his
8 failure to file a timely petition. *Miles v. Prunty*, 187 F.3d 1104, 1107 (9th Cir.
9 1999). “[I]gnorance of the law, even for an incarcerated *pro se* petitioner, generally
10 does not excuse prompt filing.” *Marsh v. Soares*, 223 F.3d 1217, 1220 (9th Cir.
11 2000) (quoting *Fisher v. Johnson*, 174 F.3d 710, 714 (5th Cir. 1999); *see also*
12 *Rasberry v. Garcia*, 448 F.3d 1150, 1154 (9th Cir. 2006) (holding that an
13 incarcerated *pro se* petitioner’s “inability correctly to calculate the limitations
14 period is not an extraordinary circumstance warranting equitable tolling”).

15 There is no evidence in this case of conduct by the Respondent or the State
16 that impeded Petitioner's ability to prepare and file his federal petition in a prompt
17 fashion. Petitioner’s response to Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss, like his original
18 Petition, simply presents an erroneous interpretation of the law, but does not
19 attempt any showing of external forces that prevented Petitioner from filing in a
20 timely fashion.

21 In summary, there are no extraordinary circumstances evident in this case
22 requiring application of equitable tolling principles. Therefore, the petition is time-
23 barred and must be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d).

24 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- 25 1. Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss (Ct. Rec. 16) is **GRANTED**.
26 2. Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Ct. Recs. 1 and 12) is
27 **DENIED**.
28 3. All other pending motions are **DENIED** as moot.

1 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is hereby directed to
2 enter this Order, furnish copies to the parties, and **close the file.**

3 Dated this 29th day of September, 2009.

4
5 s/Robert H. Whaley
6 **ROBERT H. WHALEY**
 United States District Judge

7
8
9 Q:\CIVIL\2009\Anstrom\grant.dismiss.ord.wpd
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28